DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 144 593 IR 005 216

AUTHOR Abbott, Carol; And Others
TITLE Survey of Users at the University of Oregon Map Library.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 39p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Comparative Analysis; Data Collection; Library Research; *Library Surveys; *Maps; Questionnaires; *Special Libraries; University Libraries; *Use Studies
IDENTIFIERS University of Oregon

ABSTRACT

Ninety-one randomly selected users of the University of Oregon map library were surveyed in a term project to determine user characteristics and opinions, and results were compared with a 1972 survey. Data were collected on user status, fields of study, reasons for use, frequency and time of use, type of materials used, and satisfaction with hours, materials, facilities, location of materials, and staff assistance. The results indicated: (1) a significant drop in use of the library by faculty and graduate students; (2) increased use by undergraduates; (3) increased use by people in architecture/urban planning fields; (4) decrease in overall frequency of use; and (5) continued satisfaction with staff assistance. The questionnaire, data tabulations, and a bibliography are appended. (KP)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED144593

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SURVEY OF USERS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF OREGON MAP LIBRARY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Perry D. Morrison

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

by

CAROL ABBOTT
CHRISTINE FIRTH
G. DON MILLER

Research in Librarianship
Winter 1977

IR005 216

ABSTRACT

Characteristics and opinions of a sample (n: 91) users of the University of Oregon Map Library in 1977 compared with similar data from n: 112 in a 1972 survey of same library. Data collected by questionnaire includes status of users; fields of study represented; reasons for coming to the Library, frequency of and time of use, use of other campus libraries; type of materials used; satisfaction with hours, materials, physical facilities, means of locating materials, and staff assistance; cross tabulations showing relationship between, e.g., departmental affiliation, and type of material used.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements i

Introduction 1

Literature Survey 3

Methodology 4

Discussion of Results 7

Table I: Status of Users 7
Table II: Fields of Study Represented 8
Table III: How User Learned about the Map Library 9
Table IV: Reasons for Coming to Map Library 10
Table V: Frequency of Use 11
Table VI: Use of Other Campus Libraries 12
Table VII: Time of Day the Map Library is Used 12
Table VIII: Satisfaction with Hours 13
Table IX: Types of Materials Used 14
Table X: How User Located Material 15
Table XI: Evaluation of Materials Used 16
Table XII: Rating of Physical Facilities in Regards to Working with Materials 17
Table XIII: Rating of Physical Facilities in Regards to Locating Materials 18
Table XIV: Why User did not get Material Needed 19
Table XV: Evaluation of Staff Assistance 20
Table XVI: Department Affiliation & Frequency of Visit 21
Table XVII: Department Affiliation & Type of Material Used 22
Comments 24

Conclusions 26

Appendix I: Sample Questionnaire 28

Appendix II: Stratified Random Sample of Hours 29

Appendix III: Tabulation of Data 30

Appendix IV: Breakdown of Fields of Study Represented 31

Bibliography 32

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to extend our gratitude to Edward P. Thatcher, University of Oregon Map Librararian, K, Susan Clark, Librarian Assistant, Dr. Perry Morrison, Professor of Librarianship, and Dr. H. William Axford, University Librarian, for their advice, assistance and cooperation on this project.

We would also like to thank the student staff in the Map Library for their support and extra effort during the study period. Their cooperation helped to make this project much less difficult than it would have been otherwise.

INTRODUCTION

This study was undertaken as a term project for a class in Research in Libraries taught by Dr. Perry Morrison, Professor of Librarianship. After surveying the literature, it was evident that user studies of map libraries were lacking and that more are needed.

Because a user study of the University of Oregon Map Library had not been conducted since Spring 1972, it was agreed that now was a good time to do another, particularly since the map room facility was remodeled and expanded during Summer 1976, and the materials largely reorganized in the process. In addition the collection has expanded tremendously since the previous study.

In order to achieve valid comparison between the 1972 and 1977 studies, this study was conducted as much like the previous one as possible, while at the same time trying to accommodate current conditions. For example, the questionnaires used were very much alike. Some questions were added in the current study to measure user reactions to the physical changes which occurred since the previous study, and some, which dealt with obsolete aspects of the facility and the collection, were deleted. Still, other questions were altered slightly for compatability in measurement.

While it may be argued that because of these alterations, the two studies cannot be compared in detail with a high degree of accuracy, there, nonetheless, exists a basis for comparing the results generally. We made every effort to account for the effects of these differences in our report, and it is left to the reader to judge beyond that the validity of the comparison.

In an experimental situation it would have been imperative to keep both studies exactly alike in the interest of valid replication. But these studies dealt with observations and, therefore, are somewhat less affected in their validity by subjectivity.

We hypothesized, as did Lois Holmes and LaVonne Jacobsen*, that certain results would be noted:

1. The most frequent users of the map room would be from the Geography Department.
2. A high degree of satisfaction with the facility, staff and collection would be noted.

The first was proposed because the map room is physically located in the same building with the Geography Department and much of that department's work involves the use of maps and related materials housed in the map room.

The second was postulated because a small clientele permits much closer contact with the staff and materials, and, it therefore, should show a tendency to feel more satisfied with the service.

While a cause and effect relationship cannot be proved here, user origin and degree of satisfaction can be measured. We are merely using these hypotheses as tools to guide our study and the reporting of the results. It was also felt that since Holmes and Jacobsen used some of the same hypotheses in their study, that it would offer an additional level of comparison to use them in the current one.

*For the sake of comparison, repeated references have been made in this study to A Descriptive Survey of the University of Oregon Map Room by Lois Holmes and LaVonne Jacobsen, Spring 1972. In the interest of brevity these references, therefore, have not been individually footnoted, but occur as "the previous study," "the 1972 study," or "Holmes and Jacobsen."

LITERATURE SURVEY

Library Literature was searched for user studies of other map libraries. Outside of the Holmes and Jacobsen study, which was used as the basis of comparison for this study, and the Hagen study of the UCLA Map Library in 1965, which was cited by Holmes and Jacobsen, we found only two additional studies.

Jean M. Ray, in 1974, reported on a study which was done in the Southern Illinois University Map Room. The study was conducted during summer and fall quarters 1972, and dealt primarily with borrowers of maps, as opposed to library users in general. For this reason the Southern Illinois study, although it seemed significant, was not of direct value to us.

The second study was conducted at the Meredith Wilson Library in Minneapolis during 1975-76. It dealt with a survey of telephone calls received in the map division. Whether the calls were from on or off campus, what kinds of questions were asked, and how they were answered were the subjects of the survey. This study, also, was of little direct value to our particular needs.

A user survey of the University of Oregon Science Library, done in Spring 1973, was of some general value as a guide for style and physical design. Unlike the two map library studies above, it utilized a questionnaire much like the one used in this study.

METHODOLOGY

For the purpose of comparison as to the effectiveness of the map library, we chose to use the 1972 survey as a research base. We hoped to discover information about the changes which have occurred during the time span. Therefore, we tailored our instrument as closely as possible to the previous survey of the map library. We decided upon what we felt was the most feasible method of data collection within the limits imposed by time, money, and lack of experience. In order to achieve consistency from the data collected from the patrons queried in our survey, the questionnaire method was selected. The questionnaire method does have inherent limitations such as effect, number of returns, incompleted questions, and double entry of data. We attempted to eliminate or reduce some of these disadvantages by directly handing the instrument to the user. We remained on hand to answer questions and give feed-back to comments directed to us, when necessary. By not having a mail-in questionnaire, the return rate was high and immediate.

By devising a questionnaire similar in content to the instrument used in 1972, we felt it would facilitate cross-tabulation and understanding for novice researchers. We felt this method was most efficient and within keeping of our limits. We used a variety of questions. For the bulk of it we used multiple-response which were supplemented by yes/no questions. Where appropriate, we used an "other" category and provided space for individual comments. We also made use of the forced-choice and semantic-differential questions. Our final question was entirely open ended, eliciting comments and suggestions. (See Appendix I for a sample questionnaire.)

The instrument was first pretested in the map library. From this trial

run, we were able to make necessary alterations in wording. We also submitted the questionnaire to Mr. Thatcher and Dr. Morrison for their comments and suggestions which added dimension to our survey. Their support and interest were most encouraging.

As we could not survey the complete user population, we were forced to select some part representative of the whole. In keeping with the 1972 study, we used a stratified random sample of the hours the map library is open. As in the previous survey, we sampled 14 hours during a two-week period. The sample was stratified so that an even distribution of hours could be used which would proportionally sample morning, afternoon and evening hours of the total 56 hours of service. (See Appendix II for the sample of hours.)

Each student researcher was responsible for administering the questionnaire during the hours selected. We each chose certain hours not conflicting with our individual class and work schedules, As one of the students works in the map library, several more of the hours were covered by him.

Each user was asked if he/she would mind filling in the questionnaire. We gave a brief, objective explanation as to its purpose and handed it directly to the user. Most reacted favorably and with interest. We received only a few refusals and no one was pressured to complete the instrument. Upon completion the user was asked to drop the questionnaire into a box near the door. We felt this was helpful in guarding anonymity. We were on hand to answer questions. Questionnaires were given to anyone coming into the map library omitting only regular library faculty, staff, and people from the custodial service.

As might be expected, our presence did affect normal operation of the map library, but did not seem to deter library use. Therefore, the user sample is valid.

The data collected by the survey questionnaire was then read and compiled. All information was hand-tabulated, as we agreed that this method, although time consuming, would allow each of us to experience the tabulation process at its most basic level.

It should be mentioned here that we obtained 91 completed questionnaires as compared to the former survey's 112.

Due to its nature as a class project having certain imposed limits, as well as our first attempt at library research, we were not able to study precise user habits or personality, nor was any attempt made to distinguish varying information needs among those of different academic ranks.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

After the data was collected, we met and discussed how best to present it. The results were as follows: (See Appendix III for a complete tabulation of data.)

TABLE I: Status of Users

	1972		1977	
Status	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
UO Faculty	12	10	6	7
UO Staff	1	.9	1	1
UO Grad. Student	57	51	20	23
UO Undergraduate	36	32	59	65
Student elsewhere	0	0	2	2
Other	6	5	3	3
	n=112		n=91	

The data indicated a significant drop in the use of the library by faculty and graduate students, 3% for the former, 28% for the latter. The figure for graduate student use points to a need for further research into why it occurred. We can only surmise that this might be partly due to graduate student offices no longer being connected to the map library, as they were in 1972. Where graduate use has slackened, the use by undergraduates is up a remarkable 33%. Further study is needed to uncover the factors responsible.

TABLE II: Fields of Study Represented

Department	1972 Number	1972 Percent	1977 Number	1977 Percent
Not applicable	7	6	6	6.6
Geography	67	60	39	42.8
Geology	7	6	3	3.3
Architecture/Urban Pl.	8	7	16	17.6
Social Sciences	12	10	16	17.6
Humanities	3	2.7	4	4.4
Biological Sciences	4	3.5	2	2.2
Physical Sciences	1	.9	2	2.2
Administrative units	1	.9	0	0
Undeclared	0	0	3	3.3
Other	2	1.7	0	0
	n=112		n=91	

Here we can see that, as expected, the Geography department constitutes the largest group of users of the map library. This corresponds to the findings of the 1972 survey although they are no longer the majority. As in 1972 the Geology department does not show up as a heavy user. In fact, the number of users appears to have dropped by half. In 1972, Architecture/Urban Planning made up only 7% of the sample. In the present study, the figure rises to 17.6%. Because the 1972 survey did not indicate exactly what departments were included under the general groupings of Social Sciences, Humanities, Biological Sciences and Physical Sciences, we are not able to make more comparisons in these categories. However, use by those from non-Geography fields constitutes 57.2% of the sample, an increase over the 38.7% of the previous study. Appendix IV shows in a breakdown of the fields represented that a wide variety of disciplines is making use of the map library. We can perhaps surmise from this general comparison of our findings with those of 1972, that while Geographers still make up the largest single group of users, the map library is serving a greater variety of departments than previously.

TABLE III: How User Learned about the Map Library

	Number	Percent
from instructor	61	67
from friend	15	16.5
at another campus library	2	2.2
other	12	13.2
no response	1	1.1

n=91

While Holmes and Jacobsen included this on their questionnaire, no discussion of the results was presented in their study. Therefore, no comparisons can be drawn. Here it is apparent that the great majority of users are referred to the map library by instructors or friends rather than from another campus library. This is interesting in light of the fact that all respondents indicated that they do use the other libraries on campus (See Table VI.) This may indicate that either other libraries are not making the map library known or only that the students learn of it first from an instructor or a friend.

TABLE IV: Reasons for Coming to Map Library

Reason	1972 Number	1972 Percent	1977 Number	1977 Percent
Course work	57	51	63	69
Class tour	2	1.7	0	0
Academic research	49	44	26	29
Business	2	1.7	2	2
Personal	19	17	12	13
Curiosity	16	14	7	8
Other	21	19	8	9

(multiple responses account for total greater than 100%)

When these results are compared, some differences are noted, although none seem dramatic. A larger percentage of the 1977 users indicated that they came to the map room to do "course work" than the 1972 users. This may be an indication of increased familiarity of the facility on the part of the University faculty, therefore making an increase in the number of assignments requiring the use of the map room's services and materials.

However, more familiarity on the part of the University faculty would not account for the decrease in the number of persons indicating "academic research" as a reason for using the facility in 1977. One problem which may have affected the results in this case, is the possibility that respondents found the two terms "course work" and "academic research" confusing, and, therefore, indicated one or the other incorrectly. But, since the same list of possible responses was used in both studies, there exists a basis for comparison here.

It is interesting to note here the slight drop in "non-academic" uses of the map room. The reasons for this may not be as easy to interpret since they are likely to be affected by conditions external to the institution. However, during the time of the previous study, an office for graduate students was located adjacent to the map room. It is possible that persons

coming to visit or meet with these students noticed the map room facility and wandered in just to browse or satisfy their curiosity.

Only a few persons indicated reasons under "other." Among these, "to study" was indicated most often. One person indicated his/her reason to be "to talk with librarian." Whether or not this was for library-related business was not indicated.

TABLE V: Frequency of Use

	1972		1977		
Frequency	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
4 or more x/week	48	43	17	19	frequent
1 to 3 x/week	23	20	36	40	
1 to 3 x/month	16	14	20	22	infrequent
less than 1-3 x/month	12	10	11	12	
first visit	13	12	7	8	
	n=112		n=91		

Again it appears that the percentages are lower in an area where we had assumed an increase. In the 1972 study, briefly stated, the number to use the library frequently, defined as at least once a week, is quite a bit higher than in 1977. As this is a general estimation on a sampling of users, we can observe that use is down, due probably to fewer graduate students and faculty using the library and its use by more departments for more selective reasons, and, therefore, causing less frequency of visits. Frequency of use, overall, is down 4 percentage points, with one or more times a week being defined as frequent. Attention is directed, however, to the 24 percentage point drop in use by people on a four-or-more-times-per-week basis, considered by many as daily use. In the less frequent use category, three or fewer times a month, there is an increase of a substantial 10 percentage points. Fewer people visited the map library for the first time during the period surveyed.

TABLE VI: Use of Other Campus Libraries

Library	Number	Percent	
Main	90	99	
Science	47	52	
Architecture & Allied Arts	47	52	
Other	9	10	n = 91

(multiple responses account for a total greater than 100%)

Holmes and Jacobsen did not include in their study any discussion of this question. Therefore, we present just our results. All respondents answered affirmatively that they use other libraries on the campus. Nearly 100% of the sample uses the Main Library while use of the Science and AAA libraries is evenly distributed at just over 50%.

TABLE VII: Time of Day the Map Library is Used

Time	Number	Percent	
Morning	20	22	
Afternoon	39	43	
Evening	23	25	
No response	9	10	n = 91

Again, Holmes and Jacobsen did not discuss their results to this question. Our responses show that the time of heaviest use for the map library is in the afternoon. Use in the morning and evening is nearly equally distributed.

TABLE VIII: Satisfaction with Hours

		Number	Percent
No response		2	2
Unsatisfactory	1	3	14
	2	3	
	3	7	
Neutral	4	7	8
Satisfactory	5	13	76
	6	12	
	7	44	

n = 91

The hours that a library is open or closed probably draws more negative criticism than any other aspect of its operation. It seems that unless a library is open 24 hours every day, someone is going to be dissatisified with the schedule. The map room is no exception. Of all the aspects of the map room's operation covered in this study, the question concerning hours of operation received the most negative responses. However, the over-all reaction to the hours of operation was largely favorable.

Two percent of our respondents chose not to answer this question. Seventy-six percent indicated some degree of satisfaction with the hours, and about half rated the hours at the maximum on the scale. The remaining respondents indicated a neutral or unsatisfactory response, 22% in all. The results of the 1972 study were almost exactly the same; 17% did not respond, 78% indicated satisfaction with the hours, and 20.7% indicated that the hours were either "tolerable" or "unsatisfactory."

The fact that the main library is open later at night and during weekends may account for some of the negative reaction in this area. Many respondents may expect the map room to be open the same hours as the main library, and for this reason feel particularly inconvenienced when they find it is not.

It should be noted here that many of the respondents who indicated satisfaction with the hours also suggested on the comments section below that some additional hours would be welcomed. (These comments are treated separately further on in this report.)

TABLE IX: Types of Materials used

	1972		1977	
Material	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Aerial photos	27	24	16	17.6
Atlases	30	27	22	24.2
Geological maps	14	13	13	14.3
Historical maps	12	10	11	12.1
Navigation charts	0	0	0	0
Road maps	15	13	13	14.3
Topographical maps	54	48	45	49.5
Thematic maps	25*	21.8*	3	3.3
Other	11	9.8	18	19.8
	n = 112		n = 91	

(multiple responses account for a total greater than 100%)

*For purposes of comparison, we have here combined "city plans" and "vegetation maps" from the 1972 data.

Of the respondents, 78 indicated that they had used materials during the visit in question. Twelve indicated that they had not used any materials and one did not respond. While most of our subject categories remained the same as those used in the 1972 study, because of changed arrangements in the map library we added a category to cover "thematic maps." This category includes the separate categories given to "city plans" and "vegetation" by Holmes and Jacobsen as well as other special maps in the library's collection.

As in 1972, topographical maps constitute nearly 50% of the materials used while navigation charts do not show any use. While use in most categories appears to be the same, changes were noted in "aerial photos,"

"thematic maps," and "other." Use of aerial photos has decreased 6.4%. If one combines city plans and vegetation maps to compare with thematic maps, we see a decrease of 18.5%, and an increase of 10% in the "other" category. However, because we changed the measuring instrument, comparison of these categories may not be completely reliable.

TABLE X: How User Located Material

	1972		1977	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Already knew	54	48	41	34
Card catalog	8	7	7	6
Browsed	14	12	8	7
Asked staff	64	57	47	39
Asked someone else	0	0	2	2
Other	2	1.7	2	2
	n = 112		n = 91	

(multiple responses account for a total greater than 100%)

As found in the 1972 survey, patrons are not reluctant to ask the map library staff for assistance as is common in many other libraries. Many people who use the map library already know what they want and where to find it, assumingly having had staff help somewhere along the way. Interestingly, few people browse the collection. This is felt to be due to its use by people who are there for a specific reason, as is often the case in special libraries. From our figures, more people are asking someone other than staff for help, probably fellow classmates whom they feel are more acquainted than themselves with the collection. The card catalog apparently was seldom used in 1972 or the period surveyed here.

TABLE XI: Evaluation of Materials Used

		1972		1977	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
No Response		13	12	14	15
Not Useful	1	0		1	
	2	2	3.4	0	3
	3	2		2	
	4	5	4.5	1	1
	5	11		21	
	6	12	79.8	14	80
Ext. Useful	7	67		38	
		n = 112		n = 91	

The results of this aspect of the 1977 study were very near to those of the 1972 study. Eighty percent of the respondents indicated that they felt the map room materials were useful, and about 3% indicated that they were not useful. The only changes occurred in the percentages of "no responses" and "neutral" (4) responses. The current study recorded approximately 3% more "no responses," while the 1972 study recorded slightly more "neutral" responses.

The results of the current study indicate a continued over-all satisfaction with the usefulness of the materials available in the map room. One must keep in mind, however, that many of the map room uses are there to do course work for classes dealing with geography and related subjects. This would tend to increase the over-all satisfaction, since particular materials needed to complete many assignments would always be available and would, of course, be very useful. It is interesting to note at this point that of the three respondents who rated the materials as "not useful," all were from departments other than Geography.

TABLE XII: Rating of Physical Facilities in Regards to Working with Materials

		Number	Percent
No response		2	2
Inconvenient	1		
	2	5	5
	3		
Neutral	4	12	13
	5		
	6	72	79
Convenient	7		

n = 91

No data was collected in 1972 as to the attitudes of users of the map library to the physical facilities. Therefore discussions of Tables XII and XIII here present our data and can make no statements as to any changes in attitude which may have occurred since the previous study.

Nearly all our respondents are satisfied with the facilities and arrangement of the map library for convenience in working with the materials. However, several made the comment that more working space is needed, as well as larger tables and a light table. Most respondents falling in the "neutral" category are relative newcomers to using the map library. Apparently those who use it more frequently are more apt to comment on the working needs of the users.

TABLE XIII: Rating of Physical Facilities in Regards to Locating Materials

		Number	Percent
No response		4	4
Inconvenient	1		
	2	5	5
	3		
Neutral	4	15	16
	5		
	6	67	74
Convenient	7		

n = 91

Nearly three-quarters of all respondents felt that the physical facilities and the arrangement of the room are convenient in regard to locating the materials which they want. Several users commented on the physical facilities and arrangement of the map library in our open-ended question #16. A couple of people commented on the recent remodeling in that it is nice and has much improved the facility, however more space will soon be needed. Someone else also commented favorably to the attractive bulletin board displays just outside the map library. Another commented that the facilities were satisfactory to meet their needs, but felt they needed more time to effectively evaluate the special arrangement. We're not sure if the user was attempting to be humourous or not when he/she added this comment, that the furniture "should be of designer quality!" On the negative side, one person felt an orderly arrangement was needed with a locational guide posted. Also one person felt the enlarger should be more conveniently located in an area readily accessible to the map library.

TABLE XIV: Why User did not get Material Needed

	Number	Percent
No response (user got material)	71	78
not owned by map library	9	10
checked out	2	2
missing	2	2
couldn't find anything	3	3
other	4	4

n = 91

Again, we present just our data and draw no comparison because Holmes and Jacobsen did not collect data on this matter.

Twenty-two percent of the 91 respondents indicated that they did not, for one reason or another, get the materials they desired on their current visit to the map room. Most, 10%, indicated that the facility did not own the material; 2% indicated that the material was missing; 2% indicated that the material was checked out; and 3% indicated that they just couldn't find anything on the subject. (Of the three respondents who were not able to find something on the subject in which they were interested, two indicated that they asked for assistance and one did not.) All of the respondents who indicated that the map room did not possess what they wanted, also indicated that they asked for assistance. This would seem to rule out a large number of patrons coming to the map room, browsing around unassisted, not finding what they want, assuming that the material just wasn't available at this facility, and leaving. It cannot be determined, however, if these patrons were seeking specific materials which just don't exist or whether the map room just didn't have the materials.

TABLE XV: Evaluation of Staff Assistance

		Number	Percent
No response		35	39
Unsatisfactory	1	0	
	2	0	0
	3	0	
Neutral	4	0	0
	5	0	
	6	3	100
Satisfactory	7	53	

The questions involved in this portion of the current study were worded somewhat differently from the 1972 study. The previous study used two questions: one involving staff "friendliness" and another involving staff "helpfulness." We chose to use a single question based on the "character of staff assistance" in general. It was the second part of a double question which first asked the respondent to indicate whether or not he/she sought any assistance from the staff on this particular visit to the map room. However, we did use the same seven point sliding scale as the 1972 study to measure the responses. One to three were considered "unsatisfactory," 4 was considered "neutral" and 5-7 were considered "satisfactory."

Of the 56 respondents who indicated that they had sought assistance from the staff, all of them indicated some degree of "satisfaction" with that assistance. In fact, not one rated the assistance at less than "6" on the scale. This matches the 1972 study closely, which also reported very high ratings in the staff evaluation area.

It is likely that the relatively small number of map room users would permit a high degree of interpersonal contact between patron and staff, perhaps over a long period of time, which may tend to push the over-all ratings to the high end of the scale. Also, the staff in a very specialized library, such as the map room, may <u>appear</u> to have a higher degree of

familiarity with the collection, and a higher degree of expertise in its use than the staff serving a more generalized collection. This, too, would tend to increase the degree of satisfaction with the staff by the users of the library.

Tabulation of the raw data allows for many interesting observations about the users of the University of Oregon Map Library. Additionally, cross tabulation of data will show further relationships which may prove helpful in determining the nature of use. Here, as in the 1972 survey, we present cross tabulations between department affiliation and frequency of visit, and department affiliation and types of materials used. (We have not included a cross tabulation of frequency of visit and evaluation of the staff, as did Holmes and Jacobsen, because our over-all evaluation of the staff was so high that this data would not produce any meaningful relationship.)

TABLE XVI: Department Affiliation & Frequency of Visit

	At least once a week		Less than once a week	
	1972	1977	1972	1977
Geography	58%	37%	1.7%	9%
Other	9.8%	22%	21.5%	32%

When the results of the two studies are compared, a slight shift in the pattern of use is noted. The 1972 results indicate that an overwhelming percentage of the "frequent users" (at least once a week) were from the Geography department. In 1977, the results indicate that geographers are still the more frequent users, but not by so great a margin. More "frequent users" are from other departments in 1977, 22% compared to 9.8% in 1972. If it is assumed that more people in other

departments are familiar with the map room facility now than in 1972, this shift can be expected. But we can only speculate on this point using this study.

The 1977 results also indicate a general shift toward less frequent use. In 1972, nearly two-thirds of the respondents were considered "frequent users." In 1977, the percentage of "frequent users" and less frequent users is more evenly split, with a slight edge toward the frequent user. This may indicate a more even distribution of class assignments requiring map room use, or fewer assignments in general. Again, this cannot be discerned from this study.

TABLE XVII: Departmental Affiliation and Type of Material Used

	Geog.	Geol.	Arch/U.P.	Soc.Sci.	Hum.	Bio.	Phys.	Undec.
Aerial photos	75%	0	25%	0	0	0	0	0
Atlases	50%	0	13%	18%	0	0	0	9%
Geological	30%	7.5%	23%	7.5%	7.5%	7.5%	0	15%
Historical	36%	0	45%	9%	9%	0	0	0
Navigation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Road Maps	66%	8%	0	8%	8%	8%	0	0
Topographical	45%	7%	18%	18%	2%	0	2%	7%
Thematic	100%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	50%	0	11%	22%	5%	5%	0	5%
No response/ did not use	50%	0	10%	40%	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	51%	3%	17%	15%	3%	2%	1%	5%

Because of the extent of the data involved in this table we have not reproduced here the figures from the 1972 study. We refer the reader to Table XII of the Holmes and Jacobsen report for details.

For the purpose of our study the responding departments were grouped into

appropriately corresponding categories. As we did not have details as to how the 1972 study grouped the departments we can only assume that they are similar.

The percentages from both studies indicate use of a particular type of material. The geographers consult 51% of the total of all types of materials, excluding navigation maps which were not borrowed at all during the time period used for the survey. Users from both the Social Sciences and Architecture/Urban Planning departments were each the second heaviest users of materials in all areas. The Architecture/Urban Planning users consulted a very high percentage of the historical maps, while those from the Social Sciences used many other types of materials. It is evident that many more people from other departments now use the road maps since 1972. There appears to be a greater use of all map library materials by many more departments. From this we can surmise that the need and value of the map library has increased considerably. It is obvious that more people are now aware of the map library and use it. The use by the members representing the Geology department is much lower than would be expected. From the former study, users from the Geology and Architecture/Urban Planning departments were about the same. Thematic maps were the only materials to be used exclusively by the Geography department.

Comments

The comments to our final open-ended question were perhaps the most interesting. As in many surveys, this is where the truest expression of satisfaction or dissatisfaction is evident. Of the 91 questionnaires collected, 46% had responses to question #16. Most were positive in nature, with a generally satisfied group representing nearly all departments. Several were simply a notation of thanks to the staff and praise for a job well done. Some who had used the map library before the remodelling remarked as to its great improvement. Over all, the feeling seems to be, as summed up in the words of one user, "the greatest, the best in the West!" Only one comment was made as to the questionnaire itself; it was believed to be too long. Twenty percent of all completed questionnaires offered some suggestions for improvement. Two users commented that they would like to see additional cabinet space for the aerial photos now stored in cardboard boxes. Two would like a light table, and two suggested a general guide to materials identifying the kinds of materials in the collection. Another three people urged the need of a copier machine, one requested the need of an enlarger located closer to the map library, and three felt the map library needed more space. Some of the singularly individual responses pointed to other needs and/or desires. One felt that a Geography lounge near to the library "would be great," and apparently it had been discussed as a possibility. Another user would like the map library to become known to a greater population in Lane County. One user suggested that the University increase funding to the map library as it "is a great asset to the University." Another wishes that books could be checked out from the facility. A few people mentioned map areas which needed to be built up;

more historical maps of Eugene/Oregon; materials on South America, especially recent topographic maps; and more maps of Montana and the Great Plains with an emphasis on energy development.

And there was some humor in the responses, too! One user had these rather unusual remarks, "the furniture should be of designer quality... everyone should be dressed in geographical materials (Paris Metro map originals)...trips at student discounts should be offered at the door to all destinations indicated in all and any of the maps contained in this fine library...Thanks."

CONCLUSIONS

We began this study with some expectations as to what we would find when the results were finally tabulated. Specifically we expected to find that geography students would be the most frequent users, and that a high degree of satisfaction with the staff and collection would be noted. We can say at this point that from our study results, persons from other departments appear not to use the map room facility as frequently as do persons from the Geography department, and there appears to be few people who are not satisfied with the quality of service and the collection in the map room.

In comparison to the 1972 study, there were some changes in the pattern of use of the facility. While geographers were still the most frequent users, they are less so now than in 1972, according to the current study, Use by persons from other departments, such as Architecture/Urban Planning is up considerably from the 1972 levels. Non-geographers in general seem to be using the map room more now than they did five years ago. Use by graduate students and faculty is down significantly, and use by undergraduates is up.

There were a few areas of dissatisfaction with the facility indicated in questionnaires. Many users expressed a desire to see the operating hours extended to include weekends, primarily, and some later hours during the week, presumably more like those of the main library. The need for a copy machine to be located either within the facility or the building was expressed also. (As it stands now, users must take material to the bookstore or the main library to be copied.) There is some evidence that at crowded

times, adequate work space is at a premium in the map room. The map room has been remodeled during the past year, and has more student work area than previously. But, since this specific area was not dealt with in the 1972 study, we cannot determine if the situation is improved. We can only assume that it is.

It seems that users are very satisfied with the quality of service they receive from the staff in the map room. Some of this may be attributed to the size of the facility and the special function which it provides. It may also indicate, however, that the service in the map room is indeed of a high quality.

Beyond these we can draw few, if any, definite conclusions. This was a user study, designed to observe and record. We can only speculate as to cause and effect relationships here, which we do in many cases. However, this study was too limited to warrent even in-depth speculation. We feel that it does serve to indicate areas of possible further study, and its basic design would yield very satisfactory results if used over a longer period of time than was possible here.

APPENDIX I: Sample Questionnaire

We are conducting a survey of the Map Library to determine who uses the collection and what their needs are. Your assistance by completing this questionnaire will be greatly appreciated. Feel free to expand on any question. Thank you for your time and effort.

1. Have you completed one of these questionnaires before? _____Yes _____No
   If yes, how many times? _____1 _____2 _____3 _____4 or more

2. Please check the category which applies to you and fill in the blank(s).
   _____U.O. Faculty _____U.O. Staff _____U.O. Grad. Student _____U.O. Undergrad.
   Department or Major _____
   _____Student elsewhere ... School _____ Major _____
   _____Other (please explain) _____

3. How did you originally learn about the Map Library? Please check the one which applies:
   _____ from an instructor
   _____ from a friend
   _____ at another campus library
   _____ other (please explain)

4. What are your reasons for coming to the Map Library today? Please check any or all that apply:
   _____ course work (e.g., preparing for class, homework)
   Which class? _____
   _____ class tour Which class? _____
   _____ academic research
   _____ business, industry or government needs (e.g., planning, development)
   _____ personal (for example, planning a trip)
   _____ curiosity, looking around, visiting
   _____ other (please explain) _____

5. Please estimate how often you use the Map Library. Check only one:
   _____ this is my first visit
   _____ less than once a month
   _____ 1 to 3 times a month
   _____ 1 to 3 times a week
   _____ 4 or more times a week

6. Do you use other libraries on campus? _____Yes _____No
   If yes, which libraries?
   _____ Main _____ Science _____ Architecture and Allied Arts
   _____ Other (please specify) _____

7. What time of day do you most often use the Map Library? Please check only one:
   _____ Morning _____ Afternoon _____ Evening

CONTINUED ON BACK

8. The Map Library is now open from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m., Monday through Thursday. Are these hours satisfactory? Please circle the number closest to your feelings.

unsatisfactory 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 satisfactory

If the present schedule is not satisfactory, what other hours would you like the Map Library to be open? _____

9. Did you use any Map Library materials today? _____Yes _____No
If yes, please check all those that you used:

_____ aerial photographs
_____ atlases
_____ geological maps
_____ historical maps
_____ other (please specify) _____
_____ navigation charts
_____ road maps
_____ topographical maps
_____ specialized (thematic) maps

10. How did you locate the materials that you used today?
Please check any that apply:

_____ already knew its location
_____ used the card catalog
_____ browsed
_____ asked the Map Library staff
_____ asked someone other than staff
_____ other
(please explain)_____

11. If you used any materials today, how would you characterize their usefulness? (Please circle your choice on the number scale)

not useful 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 extremely useful

12. How would you rate the physical facilities and arrangement of the room in regards to locating materials?

inconvenient 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 convenient

13. How would you rate the physical facilities and arrangement of the room in regards to working with the materials?

inconvenient 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 convenient

14. If you did not get the materials you needed today, please check any of the choices which indicate why you did not:

_____material not owned by Map Library
_____material was checked out
_____material was missing
_____couldn't find anything on subject
_____other
(please explain)_____

15. Did you seek any assistance today from the Map Library staff? ____Yes ____No
If yes, how would you characterize the assistance you received?

unsatisfactory 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 satisfactory

16. Do you have any comments on: (a) the collection as it relates to your needs, (b) the service you received, (c) the physical facilities and arrangement of the Map Library, (d) any other matters?

APPENDIX II: STRATIFIED RANDOM SAMPLE OF HOURS

Day	Hour surveyed	Q. handed out	Q. returned
Tuesday	10 a.m.	14	11
Wednesday	1 p.m.	7	7
Wednesday	9 p.m.	6	6
Thursday	11 a.m.	6	6
Thursday	4 p.m.	2	2
Thursday	7 p.m.	5	5
Friday	2 p.m.	12	11
Monday	11 a.m.	5	5
Monday	9 p.m.	10	9
Tuesday	2-4 p.m.	9	8
Tuesday	7 p.m.	3	3
Wednesday	12 a.m.	11	10
Thursday	10 a.m.	8	8
	Total:	98	Total: 91

Percent of Return: 93%

APPENDIX III: Tabulation of Data

We are conducting a survey of the Map Library to determine who uses the collection and what their needs are. Your assistance by completing this questionnaire will be greatly appreciated. Feel free to expand on any question. Thank you for your time and effort.

1. Have you completed one of these questionnaires before? ____Yes ____No
   If yes, how many times? ____1 ____2 ____3 ____4 or more

2. Please check the category which applies to you and fill in the blank(s).

   6/7% U.O.Faculty 1/1% U.O.Staff 20/23% U.O. Grad Student 59/65% U.O.Undergrad.
   Department or Major _____

   2/2% Student elsewhere ... School _____ Major_____
   3/3% Other (please explain) _____

3. How did you originally learn about the Map Library? Please check the one which applies:

   61/67% from an instructor
   15/16.5% from a friend
   2/2.2% at another campus library
   12/13.2% other (please explain)
   1/1.1% no response

4. What are your reasons for coming to the Map Library today? Please check any or all that apply:

   63/69% course work (e.g., preparing for class, homework) Which class? _____
   0 class tour Which class?
   26/29% academic research
   2/2% business, industry or government needs (e.g., planning, development)
   12/13% personal (for example, planning a trip)
   7/8% curiosity, looking around, visiting
   8/9% other (please explain) _____

5. Please estimate how often you use the Map Library. Check only one:

   7/8% this is my first visit
   11/12% less than once a month
   20/22% 1 to 3 times a month
   36/40% 1 to 3 times a week
   17/19% 4 or more times a week

6. Do you use other libraries on campus? 91 Yes ____No
   If yes, which libraries?

   90/99% Main 47/52% Science 47/52% Architecture and Allied Arts
   9/10% Other (please specify) _____

7. What time of day do you most often use the Map Library? Please check only one:

   20/22% Morning 39/43% Afternoon 23/25% Evening 9/10% no response

8. The Map Library is now open from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, and 7:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m., Monday through Thursday. Are these hours satisfactory? Please circle the number closest to your feelings.

	3	3	7	7	13	12	44		
unsatisfactory	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	satisfactory	2/2% no response
		13/14%		7/8%		69/76%			

   If the present schedule is not satisfactory, what other hours would you like the Map Library to be open? _____

CONTINUED ON BACK

9. Did you use any Map Library materials today? 78 Yes 12 No 1 no response
If yes, please check all those that you used:

16/17.6% aerial photographs
22/24.2% atlases
13/14.3% geological maps
11/12.1% historical maps
18/19.5% other (please specify) _____

0 navigation charts
13/14.8% road maps
45/49.5% topographical maps
3/3.3% specialized (thematic) maps

10. How did you locate the material that you used today?
Please check any that apply:

41/34% already knew its location
7/6% used the card catalog
8/7% browsed

47/39% asked the Map Library staff
2/2% asked someone other than staff
2/2% other
(please explain)_____

11. If you used any materials today, how would you characterize their usefulness?
(Please circle your choice on the number scale)

not useful 1 2 3 | 4 | 5 6 7 extremely useful

12. How would you rate the physical facilities and arrangement of the room in regards to locating materials?

	0	2	3	15	20	26	21		
inconvenient	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	convenient	4 no response
		5/5%		15/16%		67/74%			

13. How would you rate the physical facilities and arrangement of the room in regards to working with the materials?

	1	3	1	12	19	29	24		
inconvenient	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	convenient	2 no response
		5/5%		12/13%		72/79%			

14. If you did not get the materials you needed today, please check any of the choices which indicate why you did not:

9/10% material not owned by Map Library
2/2% material was checked out
2/2% material was missing

3/3% couldn't find anything on subject
4/4% other
(please explain) _____
71/78% no response

15. Did you seek any assistance today from the Map Librarary staff? 56 Yes 33 No
If yes, how would you characterize the assistance you received?

					3	53		
unsatisfactory	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	satisfactory 2 no responses
						100%		

16. Do you have any comments on: (a) the collection as it relates to your needs, (b) the service you received, (c) the physical facilities and arrangement of the Map Library, (d) any other matters?

APPENDIX IV: BREAKDOWN FOR FIELDS OF STUDY REPRESENTED

	Number of Respondents
NOT APPLICABLE	6
GEOGRAPHY	39
GEOLOGY	3
ARCHITECTURE/URBAN PLANNING	
Landscape Architecture	8
Architecture	5
Urban and Regional Planning	3
SOCIAL SCIENCES	
Finance	1
Anthropology	2
Business	5
Education	2
Political Science	3
Recreation	1
Physical Education	1
Librarianship	1
HUMANITIES	
RPM and Speech	1
Theatre	1
Theology	1
Journalism	1
BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES	
Biology	2
PHYSICAL SCIENCES	
Math	1
General Science	1
UNDECLARED	3
Total:	91

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arkin, Herbert and Colton, Raymond R. Statistical Methods, 5th ed. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1970.

Beeler, M.G. Francher, and others. Measuring the Quality of Library Service. Metuchen: Scarecrow, 1974.

Berdie, Douglas R. and Anderson, John F. Questionnaires. Metuchen: Scarecrow, 1974.

Berwick, Bruce, and others. (University of Oregon) Science Library Users Study. Spring 1973.

Goldhor, Herbert. An Introduction to Scientific Research in Librarianship. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1969.

Holmes, Lois and Jacobsen, LaVonne. A Descriptive Survey of the University of Oregon Map Room. Spring 1972.

Ray, Jean M. "Who Borrows Maps from a University Library Map Collection and Why?" Special Libraries. Vol. 65, March 1974, p. 104 +

Slonim, Morris James. Sampling. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1960.

University of Minnesota Libraries. "Use of Library Materials." Current Announcement and Selected Acquisitions of the Map Division, vol. 4, July 1976.